



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,562	09/12/2000	Thomas E. Saulpaugh	5181-64400	6906
7590	04/07/2004			EXAMINER TRAN, TONGOC
Robert C Kowert Conley Rose & Tayon PC P O Box 398 Austin, TX 78767-0398			ART UNIT 2134	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/660,562	SAULPAUGH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tongoc Tran	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some.* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.4.5.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicants' application serial no. 09/660,562 filed on 9/12/2000.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted 7/30/2001, 8/13/2001 and 8/15/2001 has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 15-16, 18-24 and 39-40 and 42-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Roberts et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,633, hereinafter Roberts).

In respect to claim 15, Roberts discloses the method for creating a message endpoint on a device in a distributed computing environment, the method comprising: receiving a request to create a message endpoint for a client on the device to communicate with a service within the distributed computing environment (see col. 4, lines 25-33);

obtaining a service advertisement for said service, wherein said service advertisement specifies a message schema defining messages for accessing said service; and constructing said message endpoint to communicate messages with said service address, wherein said message endpoint comprises computer executable code and wherein at least part of said message endpoint is constructed by using preexisting message endpoint code stored by the device (see col. 4, lines 12-50).

In respect to claim 16, Roberts discloses the method as recited in claim 15, wherein said constructing comprises linking said service address to said preexisting message endpoint code (see col. 6, lines 38-65).

In respect to claim 18, Roberts discloses the method as recited in claim 15, wherein said pre-existing message endpoint code comprises message transport code in said device for sending messages (see col. 6, lines 38-65)

In respect to claim 19, Robert discloses the method as recited in claim 18, further comprising constructing additional messages endpoints, wherein each message endpoint is linked to said message transport code (see col. 6, lines 38-65).

In respect to claim 20, Roberts discloses the method as recited in claim 18, wherein said message transport code is part of the device's system code (see col. 6, lines 38-65).

In respect to claim 21, Roberts discloses the method as recited in claim 15, further comprising maintaining a cache of message endpoint code, wherein said preexisting message endpoint code comprises message endpoint code from said cache (see col. 9, lines 1-35).

In respect to claim 22, Roberts discloses the method as recited in claim 21, wherein said maintaining a cache comprises storing message endpoint code for a new message endpoint in said cache when said new message endpoint is originally constructed (see col. 9, lines 1-35).

In respect to claim 23, Roberts discloses the method as recited in claim 22, wherein said maintaining a cache further comprises deleting least recently used message endpoint code from said cache if said cache is full when said new message endpoint is originally constructed (see col. 9, lines 1-35).

In respect to claim 24, Roberts discloses the method as recited in claim 15, wherein said message schema defines data presentation language messages to be sent from said client to said service and from said service to said client (see col. 3, line 63-col. 4, line 11).

In respect to claims 39-40 and 42-48, the claim limitations are substantially equivalent to claims 15-16 and 18-24. Therefore, claims 39-40 and 42-48 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14, 17, 25-38 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,633) in view of Wood et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,198).

In respect to claim 1, Roberts discloses a method for creating a message endpoint on a device in a distributed computing environment, the method comprising:

receiving a request to create a message endpoint for a client on the device to communicate with a service within the distributed computing environment (see Roberts, col. 4, lines 25-33);

obtaining a service advertisement for said service, wherein said service advertisement specifies a message schema, a service address (see Roberts, col. 4, lines 25-45 and col. 8, lines 58-67).

an indication of whether or not access to said service is restricted and if access to said service is not restricted, constructing said message endpoint, wherein said message is configured to send messages according to said message schema to said service address (see Roberts, col. 4, lines 12-33 and col. 16, lines 59-67).

Roberts does not disclose if access to said service is restricted, obtaining an authentication credential to access said service. However, Wood discloses login credentials is required in order for a requested access to be authorized (see Wood, col. 17, lines 26-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Roberts teaching of creating network services in response to requested services with Wood's teaching of requiring

different login credentials for different resource in order to protect information that require different security requirement (see Wood, col. 1, lines 57-58).

In respect to claim 2, Roberts and Wood disclose the method as recited in claim 1, wherein said constructing is performed within a runtime environment of said device (see Roberts, col. 4, lines 51-59).

In respect to claim 3, Roberts and Wood disclose the method as recited in claim 1, wherein if access to said service is restricted and if said authentication credential is obtained, said constructing said message endpoint comprises configuring said message endpoint to include said authentication credential with each message sent to said service address (see Roberts, col. 4, lines 36-45).

In respect to claim 4, Roberts and Wood disclose the method as recited in claim 1, wherein if access to said service is restricted:

 said service advertisements specifies an address for an authentication service; and said obtaining an authentication credential comprises requesting an authentication to credential from said authentication service, wherein said authentication credential indicates that said client is authorized to access said service (see Wood, col. 17, lines 26-51).

In respect to claim 5, Roberts and Wood discloses the method as recited in claim 4, wherein said requesting an authentication credential from said authentication service comprises sending an authentication credential request message to said address for said authentication service specified in said service advertisement (see Wood, col. 17, lines 26-50 and col. 1, lines 13-34).

In respect to claim 6, Roberts and Wood discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein said message schema defines data representation language messages to be sent from said client to said service and from said service to said client (see col. 3, line 63-col. 4, line 11).

In respect to claim 7, the claim limitation is substantially equivalent to claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 8, Roberts and Wood disclose the method as recited in claim 7, further comprising, if said determining determines that messages should not be verified, constructing said message endpoint to communicate messages with said service address, wherein said message endpoint is configured to communicate messages with said service without verifying said messages according to said schema (see Roberts, col. 4, lines 12-20).

In respect to claim 9, Roberts and Wood discloses the method as recited in claim 8, further comprising, if said message endpoint is configured to communicate messages with said service without verifying said messages according to said schema, notifying said service that said message endpoint for the client is not performing message verification for messages sent to said service (see Roberts, col. 4, lines 12-20).

In respect to claim 10, Roberts and Wood discloses the method as recited in claim 7, wherein said request indicates if messages sent from or received by said message endpoint for said client should be verified for compliance to said schema, and wherein said determining comprises examining said request (see Roberts, col. 7, lines 34-47).

In respect to claim 11, Roberts and Wood disclose the method as recited in claim 7, wherein said message endpoint is constructed to only verify messages sent from said message endpoint to said service (see Roberts, col. 4, lines 12-21 and col. 7, lines 34-46).

In respect to claim 12, Roberts and Wood disclose the method as recited in claim 7, wherein said message endpoint is constructed to only verify messages received from said service (see Roberts, col. 4, lines 12-21 and col. 7, lines 34-46).

In respect to claim 13, the claim limitation is substantially equivalent to claim 3. Therefore, claim 13 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 14, the claim limitation is substantially equivalent to claim 6. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 17 and 41, the claim limitations are substantially equivalent to claim 3. Therefore, claims 17 and 41 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 25-38, the claim limitations are substantially equivalent to claims 1-14. Therefore, claims 25-38 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Tripp et al. Disclose sending to a central indexing site meta data or signatures from objects on a computer network.

-Uhler et al. Disclose a method and apparatus for accessing devices on a network.

-Wollrath et al. disclose a system and method for facilitating dynamic loading of stub information to enable a program operating in one address space to invoke processing of a remote method or processing of a remote method or procedure in another address space.

Scheifler discloses stack-based system and method to combine security requirement of methods.

-Ford et al. Disclose technique of dynamically adding functionality from a client to manipulated data at a server.

-Redlich discloses IP network access for portable devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-7690. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A. Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner: Tongoc Tran
Art Unit: 2134

TT

April 1, 2004

Matthew B. Smithers
MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137